



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOCIAL ASSIMILATION.

PART II. ILLUSTRATIONS.

V. ASSIMILATION IN THE ANCIENT WORLD.

I. *Oriental monarchies—Egypt the type.*—What, now, has been the work of assimilation in the historical state? Only a rapid glance can here be given at typical civilizations of different epochs in the history of the world. But this will suffice to show that assimilation is a preparation for civilization. Without it, indeed, no high civilization has ever been attained, and advancement in civilization goes hand in hand with progress in assimilation in the true sense.

The beginnings of the history of all nations show us a ruling minority holding in check the great majority of the inhabitants. Whether the land be China or India, Greece or Italy, the same situation repeats itself. The earliest traditions of all civilizations point to the rulers as a race of conquerors, who, in the dim past, swept down upon the land and vanquished the natives, whom they speedily yoked into their service.¹ The conditions that confront us in these early days indicate the struggle of race against race, resulting in conquest and more or less assimilation, and lead us to believe that this struggle was even then an old one, dating probably many centuries before formal records of the doings of mankind were kept. First conquest and then partial assimilation is the story of these times. But in those civilizations having the oldest records, that is, in the oriental monarchies, the process of assimilation did not advance beyond certain fixed limits. Effort was first centered on the establishment of political unity, military discipline, and security from outside attack. Order was the goal for which society was striving in this first period of its development. The policy of isolation of group from group, and of class from class within the group, did not encourage the process of assimilation. All

¹GUMFLOWICZ, *Der Rassenkampf*, p. 269.

outside were foreigners and foes, and there was no bridging the chasm which lay between them. This exclusive policy was necessary at first to fix the type, but later, outliving its usefulness, it prevented development of the type and caused stagnation and degeneration.

Egypt may be considered typical of oriental civilizations, so a glance at what she was able to accomplish in the way of assimilation will throw light on the kind of assimilation prevailing in these early societies. The oldest historical monuments of Egypt by no means give the beginnings of her history. They lead us rather *in medias res*, for they present the picture of a land which had already been fought for by various races and in which ancient political regulations were even then making the attempt to keep peace between the heterogeneous ethnical elements of its population.¹ Though tradition calls Menes the first king of Egypt, he probably was no real personage, but an eponymous hero, or mythic founder of the kingdom and builder of Memphis,² the first capital. "Nothing known to have been made at the time of Menes remains," says Dr. Birch, "and he must be placed among those founders of monarchies whose personal existence a severe and enlightened criticism doubts or denies."³ After his supposed advent, however, the warring Egyptian nomes are united under a single monarch, and in consequence assimilation progresses more rapidly among the inhabitants than ever before. For the more frequent contact and the greater intercourse which such union allowed accelerated the process. Yet the degree of assimilation was rigidly fixed, owing largely to the nascent state of mechanical arts, to whose development alone easy intercourse, one of the essential conditions of assimilation, is due. The first Egyptian monarch to leave behind him an inscription was Senoferu, who is also the first to extend wars beyond his own border. Indeed, through his foreign conquests he earned for himself the title of "conqueror." Egypt's motive in these, her first foreign exploits was purely commercial.

¹ GUMFLOWICZ, *op. cit.*, p. 268.

² RAWLINSON, *History of Ancient Egypt*, Vol. II, p. 27.

³ BIRCH, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 25; quoted by RAWLINSON, Vol. II, p. 27, note.

Countries whose products were valuable for the arts—especially building—were invaded. Thus in the Sinaitic peninsula Senoferu left a commemorative tablet, and there he sent armed men to protect the workers in the mines of copper and the valuable blue-stone called mafkat. Hence Dr. Brugsch thinks he may be considered the founder of the system of military colonization. But these colonies were by no means instruments of assimilation, as were later those of Greece and Rome. Rather they were a means of forcibly preventing intercourse between the races in contact. For to the Egyptian the foreigner was but the foe—there was and could be no fellowship feeling between them.

During this reign and in the succeeding centuries the great majority of the population was bound to toil at the architectural works which have made Egypt the marvel of all lands. They were little fit for service in the field, therefore; indeed, they were not permitted to fight for their country. So Egypt fell an easy prey to invaders, the Hyksôs, or Shepherd Kings. "Men of ignoble race coming from the eastern regions unexpectedly," says Manetho, "had the courage to invade Egypt and conquered it easily without a battle."¹ "The Shepherds possessed themselves of Egypt by violence, but the civilization which they immediately adopted on their conquest was rather Egyptian than Asiatic."² At first they burned cities and destroyed temples, but soon, if not "immediately," they yielded to the influence of the superior culture about them, exemplifying the law that the superior culture tends to prevail over the inferior, even though it is the possession of the conquered people.

We see here a case of what generally happens when a horde of barbarians settles down in a highly organized country which by a stroke of fortune they may have conquered: as soon as the Hyksôs had taken complete possession of Egypt, Egypt in her turn took possession of them, and those who survived the enervating effect of her civilization were all but transformed into Egyptians,

asserts Professor Maspero.³ Though

¹ Quoted in RAWLINSON, *History of Ancient Egypt*, Vol. II, p. 198.

² MARIETTE-BEY, quoted in TOMKINS, *Studies on the Times of Abraham*, chap. 8.

³ MASPERO, *The Struggle of the Nations*, p. 61.

the victors were known as "Plagues" or "Pests," and every possible crime and impiety was attributed to them [declares the same author]. . . . the invaders soon lost their barbarity and became rapidly civilized. Those of them stationed in the encampment at Avaris retained the military qualities and characteristic energy of their race; the remainder became assimilated to their new compatriots, and were soon recognizable merely by their long hair, thick beard, and marked features. . . . They respected the local religions, and went so far as to favor those of the gods whose attributes appeared to connect them with some of their own barbarous divinities.¹

But there was a reaction—in many ways a good one—upon the Egyptians themselves, owing to their forced contact with the Hyksôs for centuries. The Egyptians were indebted to the stay of the foreigners, says Brugsch, and to their social intercourse with them for much useful knowledge.² The Hyksôs introduced into Egypt the horse and chariot,³ the practice of dating events from a certain fixed point, and new art forms, especially that of the winged sphinx.

They established throughout the territory a uniform system for military and revenue purposes, and did much to crush out that spirit of isolation and provincialism which had hitherto been the bane of Egypt and had prevented its coalescing firmly into a settled homogeneous monarchy.⁴

Thus by introducing the horse and chariot, which facilitated intercourse, and by establishing a uniform revenue system, which weakened provincialism, the Hyksôs became the means of accelerating the process of assimilation among the native Egyptians. But little assimilation occurred between the Egyptian and the stranger, however, for the ancient antipathy of the Egyptian to the foreigner could not be overcome. After centuries of foreign rule, Egypt is finally delivered from her enemies and takes the reins of government once more into her own hands.

With Aahmes, the liberator of his people from their foreign yoke, begins the most brilliant period of Egyptian history. It is

¹ MASPERO, *op. cit.*, pp. 57, 58.

² BRUGSCH, *History of Egypt*, Vol. I, p. 271, second edition.

³ "That the Hyksôs kings introduced the horse and the chariot into Egypt is generally admitted. No wheeled vehicles appear in the monuments prior to the eighteenth dynasty. The employment of chariots in the war of liberation appears in the Records of the Past, VI, 7." (RAWLINSON, Vol. II, p. 212, note.)

⁴ RAWLINSON, Vol. II, p. 201.

interesting to note that this epoch is ushered in by the introduction of Ethiopian blood into the house of the reigning dynasty, for Aahmes shared his throne with a "black" queen who took the name Nefert-ari-Aahmes, "the beautiful consort of Aahmes."¹ In after-ages she was venerated "as ancestress and founder of the eighteenth dynasty."² During the centuries that follow a policy of expansion through conquest is adopted. Perhaps it would be better to call the policy one of exploitation rather than expansion, for the conquered lands do not become a part of the empire, but merely have to pay tribute to the king of Egypt. There was no intercourse with these outside people which could result in broadening of ideas and widening of the intellectual horizon. The foreigner was still considered the foe, serving strange gods, and there was no thought of extension of Egyptian civilization among the new races. Thothmes III. was beyond doubt the greatest of Egyptian conquerors.³ He has been called "the Alexander of Egyptian history." One inscription says that a race of eastern Mesopotamia must pay him tribute, while another shows that he got tribute in gold, ebony, and ivory from Ethiopia and Nubia. Summing up his great deeds, a contemporary inscription praises him as the one who had subdued the "whole earth."⁴ The desire for universal empire appears thus early in the history of mankind. But the idea as conceived by Thothmes, the Egyptian, was quite different from Alexander's conception. The Egyptian ruler had no large ideals of assimilation and amalgamation such as animated the Macedonian. He was actuated merely by love of glory and power and riches. Of the succeeding monarchs who continued this policy of conquest, Ramses II.,⁵ known as the Great, is most famous. His reputation as a warrior is, however, exaggerated. The main object in his wars was to obtain captives whom he could employ as slaves in the building of great monuments, for

¹ BRUGSCH, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 323.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 452.

² *Ibid.*, p. 324.

⁴ GUMFLOWICZ, *Der Rassenkampf*, p. 275.

⁵ Ramses II. was a busy and boastful warrior who accomplished no important conquests. (F. LENORMANT AND E. CHEVALLIER, *Manual of the Ancient History of the East*, Vol. I, p. 247.)

his controlling desire was to distinguish himself as a builder. These centuries of foreign conquest weakened the state, since they gave opportunity for internal dissension and laxity in the absence of the ruler, and since the new lands contributed nothing toward real strengthening of the kingdom, but added only to the coffers of the kings. Egypt, therefore, finally fell a victim to conquerors herself, and since the Persian conquest she has passed through hand after hand up to the present day. Successively the booty of the Persians, the Macedonians, and the Romans, during the Middle Ages under Arabian domination, passing then under Turkish sway, only to be yielded up at last to the English control of today, Egypt has had a fate not to be envied.

Society in Egypt, as in China, was not divided into castes. All agree, however, that there existed three definite social classes—the priests, the soldiers, and the vast “third estate,” including all those who worked with their hands, from the day laborer to the sculptor, painter, and musician. This division, of course, does not take into account the slaves who were captives of war. The upper classes, the sacerdotal and the military, constituted the official class. Though in theory merit secured promotion, and the son was not obliged to follow the calling of his father, actual cases of talent in the lower ranks finding a career were rare indeed. There were schools in the larger towns open to all who desired education, and education was the measure of advancement. But, on account of the stage of civilization, relatively few from the lower classes wished to, or were able to, avail themselves of this privilege.¹ The moral code was high. It contained the three cardinal requirements—love of God, love of virtue, and love of man. Theoretically, the chief duty of the ancient Egyptian was to show charity and hospitality to all;

¹ “If the schools wherein scribes obtained their instruction were really open to all, and the career of a scribe might be pursued by anyone, whatever his birth, then it must be said that Egypt, notwithstanding the general rigidity of her institutions, provided an open career for talent, such as scarcely existed elsewhere in the old world. . . . In Egypt alone of ancient states does a system seem to have been established whereby persons of all ranks, even the lowest, were invited to compete for the royal favor, and by distinguishing themselves in the public schools to establish a claim for employment in the public service.” (RAWLINSON, *History of Ancient Egypt*, Vol. I, p. 569.)

practically, the exercise of this duty was limited to members of his own class. The official classes were really the only privileged people in the realm, and they looked with great contempt upon those beneath them. The slaves were utterly out of consideration. Custom and religion, the social controls of antiquity, allowed little sympathy between classes, and interclass assimilation could not occur. The union of such a group was necessarily mechanical and artificial; no true social unity was possible. Nor did Egypt make an effort to assimilate her conquered people. She had no desire to spread her civilization, and made little attempt to bring about an understanding between herself and her tributaries. A remarkable exception to this policy, however, is shown in the treaty of peace which was concluded between Ramses II. and the Hittites, and which is still preserved sculptured on the temple of Karnak. The humanity of the document is striking, and indicates a great change in the attitude of the Egyptian toward the foreigner. The Hittite prince is called the "Great Prince," instead of the "Vile Chief of the Khâti" as formerly, and an eternal peace is declared with the establishment of perfect equality and reciprocity between the two peoples. The treaty contains a declaration of friendship, a reciprocal obligation to avoid in future all grounds of hostility, and a perpetual truce between both peoples. It was placed under the guarantee of the gods both of Egypt and of the Khâti.¹ Yet practically no assimilation took place between the Egyptians and the peoples with whom they came in contact. To sum up: the type of assimilation occurring within Egypt was strictly aristocratic; little interclass assimilation took place; hence the result was partial. The only unity attained was that caused by the consciousness of reverencing the same ruler and worshipping the same gods throughout the entire group. This assimilation is typical of that occurring within other oriental empires.

2. *Assimilation in Greece.*—It was left for Greece to give the earliest striking instance of assimilation on a large scale. "Greece first taught the world liberty and the dignity of man," says

¹ MASPERO, *The Struggle of the Nations*, p. 401.

Renan.¹ Thus the Greeks were the people who first perceived a faint glimmering of the humanitarian idea—the idea of looking upon man as man, not merely as the member of a certain group. To this idea was due the wonderful amount of assimilation which was accomplished by Greece on the shores of the Mediterranean, and the very fact that she was able to accomplish this mainly through colonization rather than through conquest shows how far above Egypt Greece had risen in the scale of civilization.

As in Egypt, the beginnings of Greek history show us everywhere a ruling people in control of subject races. Thus the Dorians in Sparta were a mere armed garrison compared with the conquered people—the Helots and the Pericæci, who outnumbered the Spartans, in the former case, twenty to one, in the latter, three to one.² They had come as conquerors into the valley of the Eurotas and forced into servitude those whom they subjected. Throughout Greece, according to Strabo, the Greeks either Grecianized or exterminated all the peoples among whom they settled.³ The Athenian democracy, like all the other Grecian democracies, allowed the franchise to only a small minority of the population. The citizen population of Athens was twenty-one thousand, the slave population was four hundred thousand, and the resident aliens or Metæci ten thousand, at the end of the fourth century B. C.⁴ These latter could acquire land in Attica only by special vote and were liable to special taxes. They were obliged to choose a patron (*prostates*) as an intermediary between them and the state, and only through this patron could they approach the courts. Still, this tolerance of the stranger, slight though it was, marks a great advance on the original attitude of the Greek toward the foreigner. At first the

¹ *History of the People of Israel*, Vol. IV, p. 232.

² WILSON, *The State*, p. 63.

³ GUMPOWICZ, *Der Rassenkampf*, p. 340.

⁴ Census taken under Demetrius Phalerius (317–307 B. C.). Mr. Clinton interprets the first and last numbers to include only adult males, while the slave number includes women and children as well. His interpretation has been questioned by eminent authorities. See GROTE, Vol. X, p. 298, note 3; also CURTIUS, Vol. II, p. 654, note xxxii.

Greek as well as the Egyptian regarded the stranger as a being of another species, fit therefore only for abuse. In all the Grecian democracies class lines were rigidly drawn. The barrier separating the slave from the free man was practically insurmountable. Though broken down occasionally in isolated instances later in Grecian history, it was generally kept intact. There was little fellowship feeling between the master and the slave. To his owner the slave was hardly human. The citizen ranks of the Greek republics soon became divided into two great classes, the rich and the poor. "Each of the Greek cities is in fact divided into two, one the city of the poor, the other the city of the rich," says Plato.¹ All the wealth was in the hands of a few individuals possessed of colossal fortunes. This concentration of landed property led to wars, as at Lacedemon in the days of the Messenian war.² In several of the towns the rich had taken this oath: "I swear to be the enemy of the people and to do them all the harm in my power."³ The "people" of course did not include the slave class, those who really supported the state.⁴ For during the many struggles that occur between the rich and the poor the great numbers of slaves go grimly on in their task of producing the wealth which furnishes the bone of contention between the two parties.

The social and political struggles in Greece, however, served a good purpose in that they precipitated the extension of Grecian dominion and the widening of the sphere of Grecian influence. Many, finding things unpleasant at home, migrated to the neighboring shores of Asia Minor, and the islands of the Ægean. The individualistic turn of the Greek, his longing for self-expression and freedom, led him to break through the customary rule and tradition that bound him to his native land, and to seek new scenes. Thus Greek colonization which was to pave the way for Rome's universal dominion began. By means of her colonies,

¹ PLATO, *Republic*, iv, 423 (Jowett, 111).

² ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, v, 7 (Jowett, 160).

³ LAVELEYE, *Primitive Property*, p. 161.

⁴ "Slaves and Metœci supported, the citizens conducted, the state." (WILSON, *The State*, p. 60.)

Greece spread her thought and culture over the shores of the Mediterranean and accomplished an intellectual conquest, the results of which have been much more lasting than any mere territorial conquest by force of arms. Assimilation by colonization was possible only after assimilation by conquest had produced permanent groups which had attained a relative degree of stability and developed a strong race-consciousness. Such groups were early formed by the Greeks, and it was the sentiment of solidarity among them which made so successful the extension of their dominion beyond the mother-country. Their strong individuality made it possible for them, not only to maintain that individuality amid new surroundings, but also to influence the strange peoples among whom they settled, with very little effort. Egypt did not colonize beyond establishing military garrisons. She had not reached the degree of civilization necessary to this new method of socialization. Assimilation through colonization is much more rapid than that caused through conquest, for there is not, to begin with, the strong antagonism between the people in contact which is born of war. The Greek colonists established themselves in countries having a sparse population of lower culture than their own, hence assimilation to Greek civilization was rapid, acting as it did under the two laws: (1) that the higher culture tends to prevail over the lower; and (2) that the resistance to assimilating forces is less, the less compact the grouping of the passive element. The strange peoples were easily influenced by Greek example and were encouraged to adopt Greek life in all its details. Thus the process of assimilation was begun both consciously and unconsciously on the shores of the Mediterranean under favorable circumstances.

The Greek colonies were politically independent of the mother-country and had no formal union among themselves. Each colony was an independent power. The mother-city kept no hold on her colonies. Emigrants on starting out got the consent of the city gods and carried with them fire from the public hearth of the city. The mother-city supplied them with a leader whom they could recognize as the founder of their colony. Tradition weakened as the colony grew and became more and

more self-sufficing. The colonies, however, while lacking political union, were united by a distinct sentiment due to their common Hellenic blood, common religion, common traditions, and common civilization. The most famous of the colonies were perhaps Miletus and Ephesus. Miletus became the mother of over eighty colonies, sending her sons as far as the Nile, and even establishing a colony at Massalia, which afterward became Marseilles. In a word, to use Cicero's phrase, an Hellenic hem was woven about the barbarian lands of the Mediterranean during the eighth and seventh centuries before Christ.¹ Development went on more rapidly in the colonies than in the mother-country, and the colonies produced some of the greatest names in Greek history. Alcæus and Sappho, the most famous of Greek poets, were natives of Lesbos; the schools of the two oldest Greek philosophers, those of Thales and Pythagoras, were established, not on the soil of Greece, but in the colonies—one in Asia, the other in Italy. The people of Locri were the first of the Greeks to possess a body of written laws, for the ordinances of "Zaleucus," their lawgiver, were said to have been written in 664 B. C., forty years earlier than the laws of Draco.²

The process of Hellenization was not arrested when Greece herself ceased to be self-governing and fell a prey to conquerors. Rather it went forward more vigorously than ever after both the Macedonian and the Roman conquests.

The political weakening of Hellenism did not lessen its influence as a factor in civilization. The diffusion of Greek manners, customs, and speech did not slacken during the second century before Christ. About the year 100 the Phœnician language almost disappears; Greek wholly supplants it in inscriptions. The powerful protectorate that Rome held over the countries of the East did not extend to intellectual, moral, or religious matters.³

When Alexander became master of Greece and the East, visions of universal empire rose before the mind of the great conqueror. Ambition was his master-passion, and had he lived he would, no doubt, have carried his arms into Italy, Gaul, and

¹ WILSON, *The State*, pp. 77-82.

² GROTE, *History of Greece*, Vol. III, p. 194.

³ RENAN, *History of the People of Israel*, Vol. IV, p. 234.

Spain. His motives were first of all personal; love of glory and power dictated his acts. Yet he conceived a scheme for the organization of his empire which testifies to his greatness and indicates how far ahead of his time he was. Assimilation was to be induced through sympathy and interest. Mixture of races was to be encouraged, and intercourse was to be greatly facilitated. He treated the conquered with consideration; he wished to place them on a level with his own people. Persians were received into the army, and Alexander's court was composed of Asiatics as well as Europeans. The conquered were allowed, nay encouraged, to imitate the conquerors, and since it was to their advantage to do so, they adopted the strange language and customs with avidity. In order to join Alexander's army or court, it was of course necessary to learn the Greek language. Not only did Alexander thus spread the Greek tongue and culture, but he improved the countries he conquered and introduced western methods of enterprise. He grasped the great truth that homogeneity is essential to the stability of a vast empire, and he perceived that it could be attained only by overcoming race-antipathies through much contact and intermarriage. This idea was, of course, directly antagonistic to the exclusive policy then prevailing. So Alexander in colonizing refused Aristotle's advice, "to behave to the Greeks as a leader or president or limited chief, and to the barbarians [non-Hellenes] as a master,"¹ and pursued the opposite course of treating Greek and "barbarian" alike, for he saw that by this method only could race-antipathy be overcome. Had he followed Aristotle's suggestion, race-antagonisms would have been emphasized. Here he shows himself more progressive than the leading political thinker of his age. "His endeavor to overcome their antagonism [he is speaking of the Greeks and Asiatics] is one of his undying merits," says Holm.² No doubt Alexander's concern was to found a stable empire rather than to uplift humanity by broadening the views of mankind. Yet, whatever the motive, the method he used could but cause the expansion of human sympathy

¹ GROTE, *op. cit.*, Vol. X, p. 204.

² HOLM, *The History of Greece*, Vol. III, p. 386.

beyond the narrow boundaries of race and the extension of consciousness of kind. "To describe him . . . as bent on the systematic diffusion of Hellenic culture for the improvement of mankind is in my judgment an estimate of his character contrary to the evidence,"¹ says Grote. But this is only a half-truth. For he *was* "bent on the systematic diffusion of Hellenic culture," though the motive probably was *not* "the improvement of mankind." Nor do the facts substantiate Grote's further statement that in Alexander's scheme "the purpose of colonization was altogether subordinate; and that of Hellenizing Asia, as far as we can see, was not even contemplated, much less realized."² But does not his following sentence show that Alexander had the intention of Hellenizing the Asiatics? "At the time of Alexander's death there was comprised in his written orders given to Kraterus, a plan for the wholesale transportation of inhabitants both out of Europe into Asia and out of Asia into Europe, in order to fuse these populations into one by multiplying marriage and intercourse."³ Alexander realized that there would be interaction, no doubt, between the two peoples, but he felt that the predominant influence would be that of the Greek, owing to his superior culture. The Hellenization of Asia could not be "realized" by Alexander, in the few short years of life allotted the great conqueror after his career of victory began. Through his efforts, however, a mighty impulse was given to assimilation in Asia. His great schemes were scarcely started when they fell through, owing to his early death, and thus the first real attempt in the history of the world to found a universal empire⁴ came to naught, and for a long time confusion instead of fusion resulted. Even had Alexander lived, he would probably not have accomplished his purpose, for the material basis for such a union as he contemplated was not at hand. Intercourse such as is needed to facilitate assimilation was not then possible, owing to the lack of inventions which furnish us with means of easy communication and transportation. Alexander's ideas, however, were not

¹ GROTE, *op. cit.*, Vol. X, p. 204.

² *Ibid.*, p. 207.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 203.

⁴ Thothmes III. of Egypt, though he conceived the idea of world-conquest, made no attempt to found a world-empire.

born to die unfruitful, for to them, undoubtedly, the rapid Hellenization of the East that followed his death was due. Renan, referring to Alexander's conquest, says:

The most surprising result of the Greek conquest is the depth of the traces it left behind. It was not an ephemeral march through foreign countries, as were too often the campaigns of Napoleon. Its consequences were lasting; they may be compared to those of Roman conquest. The divisions which followed the death of Alexander, unlike the majestic unity of the Roman empire, hinder us from realizing the changes that followed the Macedonian expedition. To this very day the Greek church inherits this supremacy. It owes its title to the successes of Alexander, as the Latin church owes hers to Roman conquerors.¹

Thus, after prolonged contact, the Greek and the "barbarian" were brought to view each other with some degree of sympathy instead of antipathy. Through the fellow-feeling which then arose, the gulf which formerly separated the strange races was spanned. This spread of fellowship feelings made the assimilation possible which prepared the way for Roman dominion in Asia. The great work of Greece lay in the assimilation which she accomplished outside the mother-country, in the lands peopled by her colonists. Greece took a great stride forward when she replaced the idea that all outside of Greece were barbarians by the idea that all are men—human beings, irrespective of race. Yet within each little Grecian group the humanitarian idea had not advanced far enough for the slave to be regarded as fellow-man. Class lines were still rigid; differences instead of likenesses were accented; the forces of dissimulation held in check those of assimilation. Still Greece presents a great advance in civilization over Egypt, which had not attained sufficient stability to engage in the enterprise of colonization. Greece's mission was to pave the way for Rome.

The Roman conquest and consequent empire would have been impossible if the field had not been prepared for new ideas by Greek colonization, which disseminated the views of Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Socrates, and the Stoics, which enlarged sympathy and fellow-feeling.²

3. *Roman assimilation.*—How now did Rome carry farther the process of assimilation so well started by Greece? By the

¹ RENAN, *History of the People of Israel*, Vol. IV, p. 177.

² TARDE, *Les Transformations du Pouvoir*, p. 57.

time Rome was ready to try her experiment of universal empire, the humanitarian idea had developed to such an extent that race-antipathies were somewhat overcome.¹ The mission of Rome, says Professor Rudolf von Jhering, was to show the triumph of the principle of universality over that of national unity.² That Rome was able to do this was owing in a large measure to the assimilation that had been brought about on the eastern and southern shores of the Mediterranean by Greek colonization and trade. Men were not wholly hostile to each other as of yore, and because of the spread of sympathy and consciousness of kind yielded readily to new ideas and feelings. The Roman empire gives us the first instance of one of Novicow's "groups of civilization," but its union was imperfect, and it had but a brief existence. Yet, transient though it was, this group of civilization created an ideal which European nations have never been entirely able to forget. It will, too, surely lead to the formation of a new group, prophesies Novicow, which, however, must be constituted on a plan allowing a degree of justice infinitely greater than that granted by Rome. The political unity of the civilized world which Rome accomplished, and which Greece was not able to effect, caused assimilation on a far larger scale than the world had yet seen. This assimilation prepared the way for the spread of Christianity, which called to itself the whole human race, and whose very essence was to teach that toward the stranger, toward the enemy, man owed the duties of justice and even of benevolence.³ Without the fact of the Roman empire the propagation of the new faith would have been difficult, for it would have come in contact with numerous local and national gods, whose power the dominion of Rome alone had been able to weaken.⁴ Moreover, Rome's partial assimilation of the barbarian tribes on her borderland was the guarantee for the pr  servation of civilization in

¹ "I am a man, and nothing which relates to man can be a matter of unconcern to me," says Terence.

² *Geist des r  mischen Rechts*, Vol. I, p. 1.

³ FUSTEL DE COULANGES, *The Ancient City*, pp. 522, 524.

⁴ NOVICOW, *Les Lutttes entre Soci  t  s humaines*, p. 614.

the chaos that followed her downfall. Most true it is that this assimilation of the barbarians was the necessary prologue to the next scene in the great world-drama—a scene at first of anarchy, seemingly a retrogression to the ages before the golden days of Greece and Rome; yet a scene which finally resolves itself into a picture of social order far more complete and just than any given by these ancient states. Rome's work, like that of Greece, was thus a preparation for the next step upward in human progress.

The population of Rome had from the first a miscellaneous, heterogeneous composition. It is the view of Niebuhr that the original inhabitants of Italy were overcome by tribes from the mountains of Abruzzo, whose names have been forgotten.¹ First conquest, then amalgamation, in Italy as in Greece, is the order of the story. Rome began as a city state that could be crossed in a day's march. All her citizens could thus come to vote, but after her expansion it was, of course, impossible for all to come to the seat of government to cast their votes. Rome followed up her conquests by colonization, as the best means of causing assimilation and strengthening her power. The colony was sent out as an outpost of the army to help hold in subjection the conquered territory. It came out from Rome duly chartered and set up its rule with great pomp and solemnity by the celebration of religious rites. All this show impressed the barbarians tremendously and inspired them with fear and awe of the newcomers. Rome's main agent in assimilating these rude tribes was religion. Compelled by force and urged by fear, they soon adopted the gods of the Romans and along with them the customs and thoughts of their conquerors. Language as an assimilating agent was of far less importance in the ancient world than religion. Of course, through mere contact the language of the victor was imposed to some extent on the conquered. Inter-course was necessary. The slave must learn to understand his master. But in those days, when so much stress was laid on differences, the victor did not object to differences in speech. Very little understanding of the language was necessary for the

¹ NIEBUHR, *Römische Geschichte*, p. 28.

adoption of the strange religion. In fact, rites and ceremonies conducted in an unknown tongue have a peculiar power. Awe and a sense of mystery are inspired by this use of a strange tongue. Instance in this regard the practice of the Romish church still kept up. At a time when education was not a question of the day, the matter of language was not of vital importance. Hence the readiness with which the Romans of the eastern provinces of the empire adopted Greek, the language of the vanquished, is readily understood. The half-civilized peoples conquered by Rome yielded easily to Roman influence and suggestion in obedience to the law of contact of superior and inferior culture, just as in the East the Romans themselves, under the sway of the same law, had to bow to the higher civilization of the vanquished Greeks. Indeed, Greece lost little by becoming a Roman province. The life of a citizen of Athens was disturbed but slightly by the Roman conquest. Greece benefited by the change. For the establishment of peace in the basin of the Mediterranean by Rome greatly facilitated the Hellenization of the Orient. Soon Greek became the literary, judicial, and commercial language of this part of the Roman world. Latin did not contest the ground with Greek in the East.

The colony not only accomplished the assimilation of strange peoples, but it accelerated assimilation among the Romans themselves by weakening class antagonisms, through the privileges granted to the colonist. The colony was the first successful assault upon class prerogative. The government at Rome saw that inducements were necessary to entice a good element into the colonies. Rights were therefore granted in the colonies which it would be impossible to obtain at home. The temptation of advancement in the social world led many to emigrate to the colonies. At home a plebeian, in the colony a patrician. Nor did the colonist lose his Roman citizenship by adopting provincial life, but could still exercise his rights when visiting the imperial city. Land grants were given every emigrant. Thus in 422 B. C., when a colony was founded at Labici, in Latium, fifteen hundred plebeians, fathers of families, were sent out, and each obtained the *bina jugera*. In 369 B. C. two

thousand colonists, established at Satricum in Latium, obtained two and one-half *jugera* apiece. After the victory of Veii, which doubled the territory of Rome, the senate allotted to every colonist seven *jugera*. In 200 B. C., after the return of Scipio from the conquest of Carthage, lands were distributed among the soldiers.¹ So extravagant had these land grants become that by the time of Nero half of Roman Africa belonged to six proprietors!² Seneca thus complains of such land monopoly (Letter 49):

A country which once contained a whole people too narrow for a single individual! How far would you drive your plow if the boundaries of a province may not limit your estate? Its rivers run for one man; and from their source to their mouth their vast plains, once powerful kingdoms, are your property.³

At first the Roman provinces were granted no political rights, but later the franchise was extended to certain classes of the conquered peoples. In 212 A. D. Caracalla bestowed the full franchise of Rome on almost every freeborn provincial who did not already possess it.⁴

Thus the Roman city developed from age to age. At first it contained only patricians and clients; afterwards the plebeian class obtained a place there; then came the Latins, then the Italians, and finally the provincials. . . . Then all the cities gradually disappeared, and the Roman city, the last one left, was itself so transformed that it became the union of a dozen great nations under a single master. . . . There was now but a single name, a single country, a single government, a single code of laws.⁵

All free men were made Roman citizens, and the very fact that this step could be taken shows how much assimilation had already taken place. That the leveling of Rome with the provinces had begun long ere this is shown from the fact that the emperors were often chosen, not from Italy, but from the provinces. Trajan was a Roman citizen born in Spain. Hadrian

¹ LAVELEYE, *Primitive Property*, pp. 169, 170.

² *Ibid.*, p. 172.

³ Quoted by LAVELEYE, *Primitive Property*, p. 172.

⁴ "Finally, when eight or ten generations had sighed for the Roman franchise, and all those who were of any account had obtained it, there appeared an imperial decree which granted it to all free men without distinction." (FUSTEL DE COULANGES, *The Ancient City*, pp. 516, 517.)

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 518, 519.

and Marcus Aurelius were also natives of Spain. Yet, even after the bestowal of the franchise on the provincials, the distinction between a Roman citizen at Rome and one at the provinces did not disappear. Away from the central government the provincial had no means of learning its doings from day to day. Nor could he participate in its workings. Provincial sentiment influenced but slightly legislation at Rome. The cities and provinces had no other means of defending their collective rights than by putting them under the protection of a patrician resident in Rome, who could know but little of the actual conditions in the provinces, and who could, therefore, not be a very intelligent adviser on provincial affairs.

The assimilation produced by Rome, both at home and in the provinces, was only partial, designedly and necessarily so. Civilization was a class affair, the possession of the minority of the population. Interclass assimilation was not encouraged, indeed, was rarely attempted. Patricians had little sympathy with or interest in plebeians. The rights of the patrician were pretty well guaranteed throughout the empire, but the patricians formed a very small proportion of the whole number of inhabitants. As to the slaves, who were numerous, they remained entirely outside the pale. Since, therefore, the majority of the population in the provinces was a slave class, to whom little or no assimilation was possible and to whom a change of masters was quite an indifferent matter, the Roman provinces fell an easy prey to the barbarian leaders. Moreover, as the lower classes had not been assimilated with the higher, who were the sole possessors of civilization, when the upper classes began to die out, the highest thought the world had yet attained perished with them. Roman law lost the jurisconsult, while it retained the notary. Art kept the mason, but lost the architect. As the Roman empire owed its existence to the fact that a certain amount of assimilation had already been consummated among the races of which it was composed, so its downfall may be in a measure attributed to the fact that Rome neither desired to carry the process to its perfection nor could have done so had she so desired. She was restrained, not only by her own ideal of class

authority, but also by the fact that means of easy intercourse were not then available.

It may be well to here characterize briefly, according to the principles enunciated in the foregoing chapters, the assimilation of the ancient world. Though Greece and Rome show great advance in the power of assimilation over that possessed by the oriental monarchies, in general they may all be classed together. The type of assimilation was aristocratic, with the ideal of loyalty, unity of faith, and class authority prevailing. The method was coercive, the attack being made by persecution, and the response given through fear. The main agents in the process were custom and religion, and the chief obstacles were: (1) the dominant ideal of social unity; (2) the difficulty of intercourse; (3) and such strong class antipathy that interclass assimilation was not possible. The result was, of course, but partial assimilation and the establishment of unions so imperfect and unstable that they could not persist.

VI. ASSIMILATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

With the influx of the barbarian tribes into Italy after the fall of Rome, it seemed, indeed, as if civilization were lost, as if all that had been created by Greece and Rome were to sink in ruins. Now recur wars of conquest like those which preceded the great civilizations of Greece and Rome. But the striking difference between the race wars of the fifth century A. D. and those of the tenth century B. C. is that the barbarian tribes encountered a high culture, which became the determining factor in the civilization that resulted from the meeting, whereas in the case of the pre-Grecian race wars no such culture was at hand. It was yet to be evolved. The Germanic nations were thus prepared for civilization by long centuries of contact with Rome, and were already influenced by Roman ideals when their career of conquest began. The armies which invade the Roman empire are leagues of clans. The lesson that combination is a necessary principle of warfare, as is also elective, rather than arbitrary, leadership, has been learned. Three centuries after Tacitus the most famous clans of his time—the Chatti, the

Chauci, and the Cherusci—have been swallowed up in larger organizations. The new groups are the Franks, the Saxons, and the Alamanni. These are not ethnical names, but names which suggest, rather, military organization. The “Frank” is a warrior, a wanderer; the “Saxon” is a swordsman (*Sahsman*); the “Alamann” a stranger, or invader. The very fact that each of these groups, a heterogeneous mass, is able to hold together suggests that much assimilation has already taken place among the various Germanic tribes. The principle of organization in these new groups is quite different from that in the clan. *There* age and ancestry rule all. The leader is naturally the oldest man. *Here* youth and ability are potent. The opportunity for the hero and hero-worship has arrived. The war chief becomes the leader. He is chosen for his prowess, not for his parents.¹ Among the Teutonic tribes the war chief is called the *heretoch*, or host leader. Childeric, Clovis, Alaric, Hengist, and Horsa were all war chiefs.² “Clovis and his successors go by the clan title of Merowings,” says Jenks. “But this is a polite fiction; the relationship of Clovis to Meroveus, if Meroveus ever existed, is unproved and unprovable.”³ The Teutonic idea of political organization was the primitive one of a military union only. When brought into contact with Rome, the Germanic tribes could not appreciate the high development the state had there reached. Though, in obedience to the law that lower culture must yield to higher, the barbarian conquerors adopted the civilization of the Romans, in some matters the adoption was bound to be but nominal. True assimilation in many things was impossible, owing to the incapacity of the conquerors to appreciate all they found. Though the barbarian conquerors accepted the political system of the Romans; though the Germans did not try to destroy the old population or the old laws; though they did not thrust their customs on the conquered people, but rather tried to force the adoption of the strange

¹ M. Fustel de Coulanges has shown how the old Teutonic blood-nobility disappeared before the new military organization. (JENKS, *Law and Politics in the Middle Ages*, p. 76.)

² *Ibid.*, pp. 73-7.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

culture,¹ the Teutonic personal system of government was incapable of blending with the Roman impersonal system at once. So the old organization kept up was but a shadow of the old Roman system. The Merovingian king was little more than a war chief. His kingdom was to him as a piece of private property. The way in which the Frankish kingdom was parceled out in family settlements illustrates this. He understood plunder, but not that the revenues of the kingdom should be used for the common good. M. Fustel de Coulanges has shown that the word for "state" (*respublica*), so common in the Roman documents, soon disappears from the Frankish ones, otherwise so slavishly imitative. Does not this prove that the *idea* of "state" was not grasped by the Franks?²

In the early Middle Ages assimilation among the Germanic tribes was not difficult, owing to the fact that there was no fundamental race-difference between them. Attractive forces were more powerful among them than repellent. There was thus between them that potential resemblance which is the necessary psychic basis of assimilation. Since all these races had reached practically the same culture stage, adjustment of slight differences was easy, following the law that the nearer the races in contact approach the same culture stage, the easier will be the assimilation. For example, the *Schwabenspiegel* of the thirteenth century, which becomes the popular lawbook of the south Germans, is based on the *Sachsenspiegel* of the north Germans.³ That the Germanic tribes were essentially alike is evidenced by the "Nibelungenlied," which presents the picture of a homogeneous civilization, composed though it is of Norse, Flemish, Burgundian, and Gothic saga. The great epic was not written down until the thirteenth century, but it preserves traditions from the earliest times.⁴

The story of the incorporation of Saxony into the Frankish

¹Theodoric urged the Gaulish provincials to obey Roman customs and put off barbarian ones. He ordered the Jews in Genoa to hold fast to everything conducive to old Roman civilization. ("The Fall of the Western Roman Empire," *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1899.)

²JENKS, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

³FISHER, *The Medieval Empire*, Vol. I, p. 145.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 52.

empire offers the best illustration of early Middle Age assimilation following the wars of conquest. The Franks, the most successful of the Teutonic tribes, soon made the Roman empire of the West a Frankish dominion, though they adopted much of the culture of the vanquished Romans. They then entered upon a career of conquest which ended only with the death of Charles the Great. In the assimilation of the tribes which followed every conquest the church was the great instrument, and the method adopted was coercion. The Saxons resisted longer than any other race the attempts of the Franks, but finally they too succumbed. The conditions of the peace show the ideal of assimilation that existed. They were, that the Saxons should accept Christianity, and become one people with the Franks.¹ Both the Frankish religious and political systems were imposed upon the Saxons. Baptism was enforced at the point of the sword. Fines were exacted for heathen prayers and offerings by fountains and streams, and in groves. The observance of Sunday was enjoined. Saxon hostages were educated in Frankish cloisters and then sent back to spread their views among their own people, and the monasteries established throughout Saxony thus became radiating centers of Frankish influence. The ideal of Christianity—the brotherhood of man—was a powerful force in blending these warlike tribes. The “Heliand,” a poem of the ninth century, reflects the fusion of the new religion with the old barbarian creed, and shows that Christianity in its purity could not in the nature of things be adopted by these rude peoples, without absorbing the color of their concrete northern mythology. In this poem Christ appears as the leader of a *comitatus*, and the disciples are his *comites*.² In 802 Charles ordered the law of the Saxons to be written down with such alterations as were made necessary by the incorporation of Saxony into the Frankish empire.³ Indeed, the period of conquest in west Europe, that of Charles Martel, Pepin the Short, and Charles the Great, corresponds to the period of law-producing activity. During this epoch were produced the laws of the Alamanni, the Bavarians, the Frisians, the Thuringians, and the Saxons. Thus

¹ FISHER, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 88, 89.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

from the contact of races progress results, says Jenks.¹ The interaction in the process of assimilation that was going on between the Franks, who preserve best the traditions of the Roman empire, and the various Teutonic tribes, is shown in the gradual fusion of the principles of the old Roman law—those of uniformity and obedience—with the principle of individuality appearing for the second time in the world's history in the political system of the Teutonic tribes. From this union, which it took centuries to consummate, our modern political system was born. Charles did not care to interfere with Saxon customs so long as they did not conflict with his political or religious schemes. In matters affecting Saxony the emperor was guided by the advice of Saxons. The assimilation between the Saxons and their conquerors was so complete that about a century after the death of Charles, Henry the Saxon became monarch at the death of Conrad the Franconian, and for one hundred and five years the Saxon dynasty ruled Germany.²

By the thirteenth century assimilation among the Germanic tribes had progressed to such a degree that the whole of Europe was held under the sway of one social order—that of feudalism. Unity of opinion on the two important matters, God and king, had been established. But, as this social system, for the sake of its own existence, could not allow further fusion, it put a stop to the process of assimilation for the time being. The feudal system was founded on the principles of personal obedience and land-ownership, and formed an intermediate stage or connecting link between the ancient and the modern state. The Teutonic king of the Middle Ages is at first a war chief, says Jenks, and the state is a band of warriors.³ Then the king becomes maintainer of order within his realm. The mediæval kingship is at first purely elective. But it soon becomes hereditary, for the king always had large domains before his election, and what more natural than that his son should inherit his kingship along with his possessions? Next the king becomes judge. Through the feudal position of the mediæval king, the fief is a judicial as

¹ JENKS, *Law and Politics in the Middle Ages*, pp. 10, 11.

² FISHER, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 94.

³ JENKS, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

well as a military unit. Finally the king becomes administrator. The Middle Age state was limited to the king and those who had sworn fealty to him. The territory consisted of their fiefs. The limitation of military service to the immediate vassals of the king left the state a narrow institution, which could not include all the members living in the same territory. Since feudal ideas prevented assimilation between classes, the most numerous part of every community was left out of direct participation in government and defense. How much the feudal system retarded assimilation is shown by the slow amalgamation that took place between the Normans and the Anglo-Saxons in England after William's conquest in 1066. Though the feudal system as established by him in England¹ was less rigid than that on the continent, yet it was largely responsible for the non-assimilation of the two peoples for a long time after the invasion. Henry II. weakened the system when he struck a blow at the military colonies established by William for holding down the people. He expelled all the foreign mercenaries who had been employed in the colonies and destroyed no fewer than three hundred and seventy-five, some say one thousand, of the castles which had been used as garrisons for the soldiers.² After this, assimilation went on more rapidly. Yet the segregation of merchants and traders in separate communities from the English towns hindered intercourse, and consequently assimilation, until far down into the age of modern history. It gradually came about that more communication was necessary, and convenience dictated the use of the same language. So the Normans at last adopted the language of the native majority, though not without influencing it themselves, and from the fusion we have the English of today.

In the early centuries of the Christian era, during the epoch of barbarian conquests, assimilation of the different Germanic

¹ "When King William summoned the knights of all his followers, or, as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* puts it, 'All the land-owning men of property there were over all England, *whosoever men they were,*' and made them swear oaths of fealty to him against all other men, he was enlarging the boundaries of the state and marking an epoch in its history." (JENKS, *op. cit.*, p. 93.)

² CLARK, *Medieval Military Architecture*, Vol. I, p. 60; quoted by CUNNINGHAM, *Alien Immigrants to England*, p. 28.

tribes followed rapidly. But when feudalism fastened its iron grasp on all of Europe, assimilation was practically stopped. Society became fixed in definite grooves; classes were then as separate as ever before in the world's history. Hence the feudal system with its concentration and isolation was a hindrance to progress. During the ages of feudalism there were, however, two unifying influences, the Roman Catholic church and the Holy Roman Empire, the first real, the latter but a fiction, yet a powerful factor. The church taught the brotherhood of man irrespective of classes, and the subjection of all men to God. It was the church, too, that gave impulse to the two great movements that shattered to some extent the feudal system and gave occasion for the further work of assimilation. These were the crusades and in the late Middle Ages immigration from land to land on account of religious persecution. The crusades, which gave a common impulse and a common cause for union among men all over Europe, irrespective of class or nationality, may be regarded as the first assault upon the social order of mediæval Europe, for by the numerous contacts they occasioned they reawakened powerful unifying forces. During the late Middle Ages and the early period of modern history immigration appears as the second great disturbing element in feudal society. At the time of the Reformation, and later, religious persecution impelled foreigners to settle in England, not that they were attracted to England, but that they must go somewhere, and England was most accessible. One great current of immigration flowed into England from the Netherlands in the time of Alva and, one hundred and twenty years later, another, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV. The immigrants brought with them knowledge of textile arts, and so influenced industry. There was interaction and exchange in some things, but the incoming people always adopted the national ideal of liberty and government, and England assimilated the new people readily, owing to her strength of national character.

Religion is the chief assimilating agent during the whole of the Middle Ages, and at the dawn of modern history it becomes

more potent perhaps than ever. Persecution is the chief means of bringing the agent to bear, and in some countries, as in Spain, it has been employed so effectively that the uniformity of thought it has induced has proved the doom of the nation. Assimilation, which started in well after the barbarian conquests, was retarded by the institution of feudalism. During the long ages when the feudal system held sway, in spite of the isolation which this engendered, European society was united by the feeling of reverence for a common God, with his earthly representative in the pope, and of devotion to a common emperor. The Roman Catholic church and the Holy Roman Empire were the bonds which held Europe together and made possible the next advance in the history of civilization. The crusades were the first step in the movement which culminated in the destruction of the institution of feudalism and the rise of modern states. In brief, religion was the chief assimilating agent, persecution the means of assimilation, and feudalism the obstacle to assimilation during the Middle Ages.

SARAH E. SIMONS.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

[*To be continued.*]